



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,370	07/31/2003	Stuart S. Kreitzer	CE11296JEM	2130
24273 7590 03/20/2007 MOTOROLA, INC INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION LAW DEPT 8000 WEST SUNRISE BLVD FT LAUDERDAL, FL 33322			EXAMINER KLIMACH, PAULA W	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 03/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/631,370	KREITZER, STUART S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paula W. Klimach	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A-SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-12, and 14-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-12 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 01/24/07. The amendment filed on 01/24/07 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently pending claims are 1-7, 9-12, and 14-21.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 01/24/07 with respect to amended claims 1, 11, 14, and 21 have been fully considered and are found persuasive. However a new reference has been introduced to discuss the newly amended subject matter.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 10, 14, 18, and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (5,390,252) in view of Brody (6,278,697 B1).

*In reference to claims 1 and 14*, Suzuki discloses a system and method of establishing secure communications in a multi-mode portable communication device, comprising the steps of: establishing a symmetric traffic key between the multi-mode portable communication device and a second portable communication device in a first mode of communication (Fig. 3); switching to

Art Unit: 2135

at least a second mode of communication (column 5 lines 38-45); and following the switch sharing the symmetric traffic key between the multi-mode portable communication device and the second portable communication device (column 5 line 60 to column 6 line 12).

Although Suzuki discloses the change of mode during communications, Suzuki does not expressly disclose the first mode of communication in a first communication network and protocol and the second mode of communication in a different communication network and protocol.

Brody discloses a system that supports a first communication protocol and switching to a second mode of communication in a different communication network that supports a different communication protocol (Fig. 11).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to change protocols for a different network as in Brody in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the system will allow for conversion of telecommunication protocols in a manner that permits communication between devices that utilize different protocols and reduces communication overhead over the PSTN (Brody column 2 lines 25-30).

*In reference to claim and 18*, Suzuki discloses a system wherein the step of storing a predetermined number of symmetric traffic keys in a cache memory associated with a predetermined number of other portable communication devices in recent communication with the multi-mode portable communication device (column 7 lines 31-37).

*In reference to claims 10 and 20*, Suzuki establishes a key exchange with a plurality of other predetermine portable communication devices during a background mode (Fig. 16).

Wherein mode 1 corresponds to the idle mode.

*In reference to claim 6*, Suzuki does not disclose a system wherein the step of switching to the second mode from the first mode comprises switching among modes comprising CDMA, TDMA, GSM, and WLAN.

Brody discloses a system wherein the step of switching to the second mode from the first mode comprises switching among modes comprising CDMA, TDMA, GSM, and WLAN (column 12 lines 9-21).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to change protocols for a different network as in Brody in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the system will allow for conversion of telecommunication protocols in a manner that permits communication between devices that utilize different protocols and reduces communication overhead over the PSTN (column 2 lines 25-30).

**Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Brody and further in view of Whelan et al (6,965,674 B2).

*In reference to claim 7*, Suzuki discloses a system and method wherein the step of storing the symmetric traffic key in a phonebook record associated with the second portable communication device (column 7 lines 31-37).

Whelan discloses a system wherein the traffic key is stored in a recent call list that reflects recent communication between the portable communication device and a second portable communication device (column 5 lines 30-33; column 10 lines 19-42; Fig. 4)

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the traffic key in a recent call list as in the system of Whelan in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would make it impractical for a hacker to gather sufficient network traffic using any one WEP key to decrypt that key (Whelan column 7 lines 54-65).

**Claims 2-3, 9, 11-12, 15, 19, and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Brody and further in view of Schneier.

*In reference to claims 2 and 15*, Although Suzuki discloses encrypting the communication between the mobile portable station and the current base station (device that communicates with the portable station), Suzuki does not expressly disclose a system that uses Automatic Public Key Exchange techniques.

Schneier teaches using the public key exchange system using private keys along with a public key of a peer unit before commencing secure communications (page 48).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the public and private keys to perform the key exchange as in Schneier in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would make key-exchange easier.

*In reference to claim 3*, although Suzuki discloses encrypting the communication between the mobile portable station and the current base station (device that communicates with the portable station), Suzuki does not expressly disclose a system that uses Automatic Public Key Exchange is implemented using public-key algorithms such as Diffie-Hellman cryptography

Art Unit: 2135

or Elliptic Curve Cryptography.

Schneier discloses a system that uses public-key algorithms for Public Key Exchange techniques (page 48 paragraph 2).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the public and private keys to perform the key exchange as in Schneier in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would make key-exchange easier.

*In reference to claims 9 and 19*, Suzuki discloses a system wherein the step of establishing a new communication session between the multi-mode portable communication device and the second portable communication device without requiring a new key establishment process (column 3 lines 30-40).

However, Suzuki does not expressly disclose a system that uses Automatic Public Key Exchange techniques.

Schneier teaches using the public key exchange system using private keys along with a public key of a peer unit before commencing secure communications (page 48).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the public and private keys to perform the key exchange as in Schneier in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would make key-exchange easier.

*In reference to claims 11 and 21*, Suzuki discloses a method and system of establishing secure communications among a plurality of portable communication devices, comprising the steps of: storing information associated with a predetermined number of other portable

Art Unit: 2135

communication devices (column 7 lines 31-37); establishing a symmetric traffic key between a first portable communication device and the predetermined number of other portable communication devices during an idle mode of the first portable communication device (column 5 line 60 to column 6 line 12), wherein the idle mode corresponds to the mode 1 because at this mode no information is being transferred, but the system is ready therefore making this an idle mode; and establishing a secure communication session in a first type of communication between the first portable communication and at least one among the predetermined number of other portable (Fig 16); switching to at least a second type of communication (column 5 lines 38-45); and following the switch, sharing the symmetric traffic key between the multi-mode portable communication device and the second portable communication device (column 5 line 60 to column 6 line 12, abstract).

Although Suzuki discloses encrypting the communication between the mobile portable station and the current base station (device that communicates with the portable station), Suzuki does not expressly disclose a system that uses Automatic Public Key Exchange is implemented using public-key algorithms such as Diffie-Hellman cryptography or Elliptic Curve Cryptography.

Schneier discloses a system that uses public-key algorithms for Public Key Exchange techniques (page 48 paragraph 2).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the public and private keys to perform the key exchange as in Schneier in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would make key-exchange easier.



Although Suzuki does disclose the change of mode during communications, Suzuki does not expressly disclose the first mode of communication in a first communication network and the second mode of communication in a different communication network.

Brody discloses a system that transmits in one mode to one communication device, and therefore one network, and switches protocols to the second communication device, and therefore another network (Fig. 13 part 368). Brody teaches further the first communication network supports a first communication protocol and that a second communication protocol is different from the first communication protocol (Fig. 13 parts 368 and 364).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to change protocols for a different network as in Brody in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the system will allow for conversion of telecommunication protocols in a manner that permits communication between devices that utilize different protocols and reduces communication overhead over the PSTN (Brody column 2 lines 25-30).

*In reference to claim 12*, Suzuki discloses a system wherein the step of establishing a symmetric traffic key comprises contacting the predetermined number of other portable communication devices to determine if their respective keys have expired and performing a background exchange to re-establish a fresh key if the respective key has expired (column 6 lines 55-65).

**Claims 4-5 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, Brody and Schneier as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of the article by L-3 Communications.

*In reference to claims 4 and 16*, although Suzuki discloses encrypting the communication between the mobile portable station and the current base station (device that communicates with the portable station), Suzuki does not expressly disclose a system that uses Automatic Public Key Exchange techniques. Suzuki does not expressly disclose a system wherein the Automatic Public Key exchange is implement by combining public-key algorithms with a signaling scheme such as Future Narrow Band Digital Terminal protocol.

L-3 discloses a terminal that implements the Future Narrow Digital standard and therefore protocol. The protocol includes key management and therefore key exchange (page 1).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the future narrow band with digital terminal protocol as disclosed by L-3 in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Future Narrow Band Digital Terminal Protocol does not tie one down to a specific network, but instead assures operation over a variety of narrow band wide band (L-3 page 1).

*In reference to claim 5*, although Suzuki discloses the switching from one mode to the second mode (column 5 lines 38-55), Suzuki does not disclose the modes comprising interconnect voice, dispatch voice, peer-to peer data, and peer to peer voice

L-3 teaches that FNDT standard defines several modes of operation.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement several modes of operation disclosed by L-3 in the system of Suzuki.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because vendors are permitted by the FNBDT to incorporate their own enhancements therefore products can meet a set of general requirements (L-3 page 1).

**Claim 17** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Brody as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of the L-3 communications.

*In reference to claim 17*, although Suzuki discloses the switching from one mode to the second mode of communication (column 5 lines 38-55), Suzuki does not disclose the modes comprising interconnect voice, dispatch voice, peer-to peer data, and peer to peer voice

L-3 teaches that FNBDT standard defines several modes of operation.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement several modes of operation disclosed by L-3 in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because vendors are permitted by the FNBDT to incorporate their own enhancements therefore products can meet a set of general requirements (L-3 page 1).

Suzuki does not disclose a system wherein the step of switching to the second mode from the first mode comprises switching among modes comprising CDMA, TDMA, GSM, and WLAN.

Suzuki does not disclose a system wherein the step of switching to the second mode from the first mode comprises switching among modes comprising CDMA, TDMA, GSM, and WLAN.

Brody discloses a system wherein the step of switching to the second mode from the first

Art Unit: 2135

mode comprises switching among modes comprising CDMA, TDMA, GSM, and WLAN (column 12 lines 9-21).


At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to change protocols for a different network as in Brody in the system of Suzuki. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the system will allow for conversion of telecommunication protocols in a manner that permits communication between devices that utilize different protocols and reduces communication overhead over the PSTN (column 2 lines 25-30).

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paula W. Klimach whose telephone number is (571) 272-38544. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Thr 9:30 a.m to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
KIM VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100